

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The specification has been amended to overcome the objection applied thereto. More specifically, the specification has been amended to indicate that the disclosed FLS refers to a flight management landing system, as would be recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art. No new matter is believed to be introduced by the amendment of the specification.

Claim 12 has been amended for clarity and to, thereby, overcome the applied objection.

Regarding the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejections, the Office Action proposes that the specification does not describe (1) the plurality of assisted approach modes and (2) the virtual approach axis, in a manner to enable those of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention (see Office Action page 2, section 4). The Applicants respectfully traverse as follows.

The specification discloses that a computer provides information regarding the threshold position of a landing strip and a slope of descent and this information characterizes a virtual approach axis of an assisted approach mode (see paragraph [0044] of the published specification). At the time the present invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that a descent slope intersecting the threshold position of a landing strip may define a desired flight path (i.e., virtual approach axis) for landing an aircraft. One of ordinary skill in the art further would have recognized that any one of multiple descent slopes may be selected for landing the aircraft and that each descent slope characterizes a different mode of approach. Thus, for these reason, it is submitted that the specification is enabling and provides

an adequate written description so that withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejections is deemed to be warranted.

Regarding the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejections, the Office Action inquires how the same guidance laws are used in both modes when the user device is disclosed as being either an auto pilot or a display and how exactly does a display make use of the guidance laws when it does not actually control the aircraft (see Office Action section 7).

The specification describes how both an auto pilot and the pilot using a display may use guidance laws in paragraph [0039] of the published specification. More precisely, the user device 4 uses the information provided by the landing aid multimode receiver 5 to allow the guidance of the aircraft up to its landing, either directly (the user device 4 can then comprise an automatic pilot), or indirectly (the user device 4 can then comprise a display screen, for presenting the information to the pilot who in this case carries out the guidance).

It is submitted that the above description answers the questions raised in the Office Action, and therefore, withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections is deemed to be warranted.

Claims 2-4, 14, and 15 stand rejected, under 35 USC §102(e), as being anticipated by Stratton (US 6,239,745). Claims 5-13 and 16 stand rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Stratton in view of Staggs (US 6,711,479). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as follows.

Independent claim 14 defines an aircraft piloting system that implements both a precision approach and a non-precision approach mode of landing and in which: (1) the same guidance laws are used for both the precision mode and non-precision mode of landing, (2) multiple

approach modes are possible for the non-precision approach mode of landing, (3) a pilot may select one of the assisted approach modes, and (4) a virtual approach axis is representative of the assisted approach mode selected by the pilot.

The Office Action proposes that Stratton discloses the subject matter of claim 14 in column 3, lines 35-56, and column 7, lines 48-56 (see Office Action page 3, section 10). However, in column 3, lines 35-56, Stratton discloses computing a vertical glide slope deviation using position data and differential correction information. In column 7, lines 48-56, Stratton discloses a multi-mode receiver that supports three precision-landing modes within a single device.

However, it is noted that Stratton does not disclose the Applicants' claimed subject matter of an aircraft piloting system that implements both a precision approach landing mode and a non-precision approach landing mode. Stratton also does not disclose the Applicants' claimed subject matter in which: (1) the same guidance laws are used for both a precision mode and a non-precision mode of landing, (2) multiple approach modes are possible for the non-precision approach, (3) a pilot may select one of the assisted approach modes, and (4) a virtual approach axis is representative of the assisted approach mode selected by the pilot.

The Office Action fails even to address the above-noted features of the instant claims. If the present rejection is reasserted in a subsequent Office Action, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out the exact portions of Stratton that are alleged to disclose each of these claim features.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that Stratton does not identically disclose the subject matter defined by claim 14 and, thus, does not anticipate this claim. Independent claim 16

similarly recites the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing claim 14 from Stratton's disclosure, and Staggs is not cited in the Office Action for supplementing the teachings of Stratton in this regard (see Office Action page 4, sections 3 and 4). Therefore, the rejections applied to claims 5-13 are obviated and allowance of claims 14 and 16 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: December 8, 2009
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 073070-04109
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 659-6966
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559